

|   |                        |                     |  |
|---|------------------------|---------------------|--|
| <b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b> | <b>Application No.</b> | <b>Applicant(s)</b> |  |
|   | 09/937,873             | JUNG ET AL.         |  |
| <b>Examiner</b>                             | <b>Art Unit</b>        |                     |  |
| Kevin L McHenry                             | 1725                   |                     |  |

**All Participants:**
**Status of Application:** Allowed

(1) Kevin L McHenry, examiner. (3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(2) Josh Randall, applicant's representative. (4) \_\_\_\_\_.

**Date of Interview:** 15 March 2004
**Time:** 2:30 pm
**Type of Interview:**

Telephonic  
 Video Conference  
 Personal (Copy given to:  Applicant  Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated:  Yes  No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

*none*

Claims discussed:

*11*

Prior art documents discussed:

*none*
**Part II.**
**SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:**
*See Continuation Sheet*
**Part III.**

It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner indicated that the application was allowable except for language in claim 11 regarding the isolation valve that was unclear. The examiner noted that it was unclear how the isolation valve functioned independently of the casting chamber and how this was even possible since the isolation valve provided a seal for the vacuum of the casting chamber. The examiner noted that the other language of claim 11, particularly that regarding the chamber valve and its independence of the isolation valve, overcame the prior art. Agreement was reached to amend claim 11 in order to place the application in condition for allowance.